

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7-8, 10, and 21-22

Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 7-8, 10, and 21-22 ultimately depend. Claims 1, 7-8, 10, and 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Admitted Prior Art (“APA”) in view of Pfleeger, “Security in Computing”. Claim 21 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and which would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 21 directly depends from claim 1.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the limitations of claim 21. Claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, 7-8, and 10 are allowable.

Claims 11-14 and 23-24

Claim 11 is an independent claim, from which claims 12-14 and 23-24 ultimately depend. Claims 11-14 and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over APA in view of Pfleeger. Claim 23 has been objected to as containing allowable subject matter, and directly depends from claim 11.

Applicant has amended claim 11 to recite the limitations of claim 23. Claims 23 and 24 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 11-14 are allowable.

Claims 15-18 and 25-26

Claim 15 is an independent claim, from which claims 16-18 and 25-26 ultimately depend. Claims 15-18 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over APA in view of Pfleeger. With respect to claims 25 and 26, the Examiner has indicated that these claims have also been rejected under 35 USC 103(a), but no discussion as to these claims is presented in the final office action. **Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 should in fact have been**

indicated and objected to as containing allowable subject matter, insofar as the limitations of claim 25 mirror those of claims 21 and 23, which have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 25 directly depends from claim 15.

Therefore, Applicant has amended claim 15 to recite the limitations of claim 25, and claims 25 and 26 have been cancelled. Applicant submits that claims 15-18 are allowable.

If the Examiner disagrees that claim 15 is now allowable, he is very respectfully requested to contact Applicant's representative, Mike Dryja, at the phone number listed below, BEFORE issuing an advisory action, so that claim 15 can be made allowable. Applicant very much would like for this patent application to be allowed, and believes that the Examiner's contacting Mr. Dryja would be the most efficient route to allowance in this respect.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



January 8, 2007
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
704 228th Ave NE #694
Sammamish, WA 98074
tel: 425-427-5094, fax 206-374-2819